

REMARKS

This Amendment is a submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in response to the Office Action.

The disposition of the claims in the Office Action was as follows:

- claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14-22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32-35, 37, 40, 42, 43, 45, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 7,188,317 to Hazel in view of U.S. Patent 6,338,067 to Baker et al.; and
- claims 46-48 were allowed.

Applicants traverse the rejections as follows.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented interactive user interface that allows a user to navigate quickly the supply chain of a company identified in a first field of the display (the so-called “focal company”). A second field on the display includes company identifiers that identify companies that are suppliers to the focal company that receive a threshold percentage of their revenue from the focal company. In other claimed embodiments, there are other fields that include company identifiers that identify customers and competitors of the focal company, respectively. Some company identifiers in the second field (or other fields) are associated with hyperlinks that, when activated, cause the selected company identifier to move to the first field, making it the new focal company. In that case, the second field is regenerated to include company identifiers that identify suppliers of the new focal company. Similarly, the other fields could be regenerated to include company identifiers that identify customers and competitors of the new focal company, respectively. In such a manner, a user can navigate quickly—and in an interactive manner—company supply chains. This is a very valuable tool for

persons, like traders of financial securities (like stocks and bonds), who have to respond quickly to breaking financial news or have to assess complicated financial risk factors quickly.

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected as obvious over the combination of Hazel and Baker. Hazel is directed to a dynamic multiple window display that has independently linked windows. Baker discloses a product hierarchy database that organizes company market performance and stock investment information by the products and services produced and offered by each company. For example, the product hierarchy described in Baker may identify the various components used to make a top level product, and the companies that make the various components (*see, e.g.*, Baker at col. 9:57 to col. 10:25). Baker, however, nowhere describes its database as including data on which suppliers of the components to a maker of a top-level product receive a threshold percentage of their revenue through sales to the maker of the top-level product. Nevertheless, the Office Action asserts that claim 1 is obvious because the recited “threshold percentage of revenue received from the focal item company” could be set so low (such as .0001%) that a listing of every supplier would theoretically satisfy this limitation.

See Office Action at 15.

Applicants disagree with this assertion. Nevertheless, in order to expedite allowance, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the second field further comprises a supplier level indicator for at least one company identifier included in the second field that indicates the percentage range of revenue received by the company from the focal company. For example, as explained in the present application at ¶ [0013], in one embodiment the supplier level indicators could be pie charts that separately indicate the supplier companies that receive (1) 75% or more of their revenue from the focal item company, (2) between 50% and 75%, and (3) between 25% and 50%. This way, the second field not only identifies the major suppliers to the focal company

(i.e., the ones above the threshold level), but also identifies in a readily apparent manner the particular suppliers that are most heavily dependent on the focal company.

The combination of Hazel and Baker would have no way of providing such supplier level indicators because Baker's database has no information on how much revenue a supplier receives from a particular customer (other than that it may receive some, non-zero amount of revenue). Because the Baker database contains no more granular revenue data, Baker teaches against a supplier level indicator, as in claim 1, that indicates the percentage range of revenue received by the supplier company from the focal company. According to the Office Action, a list of the suppliers to a particular company theoretically could be created from Baker's database, but no further information regarding the levels of revenue is available in Baker's database. As a result, a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to include such supplier level indicators of revenue based on Baker. Any such indicator based on Baker would be superfluous as it would add no additional meaningful information (because there is no such data in Baker's database to add), and a person having ordinary skill in the art designing an interactive interface to navigate supply chains would not be motivated to include superfluous indicators that do not convey additional meaningful information. Thus, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to include in the second field an indicator indicating the percentage of revenue received by the supplier company from the focal item company based on Hazel and Baker.

Therefore, amended claim 1 and its dependent claims are nonobvious in view of the cited references. *See MPEP § 2143.03* (stating that if an independent claim is nonobvious, then claims depending therefrom are nonobvious).

Independent claims 14, 19, 33, 49, and 50 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. For analogous reasons, therefore, these claims and their respective dependent claims are also nonobvious in view of the cited references.

New dependent claims 51-56 and 63-67 have been added. These claims recite additional features that distinguish the cited references.

Allowed claims 46-48 have been amended to be limited to embodiments where the second field identifies suppliers to the focal item company. New independent claims 57-59 have been added, which are similar to claims 46-48, but are limited to embodiments where the second field identifies customers of the focal item company. Similarly, new independent claims 60-63 have been added, which are similar to claims 46-48, but are limited to embodiments where the second field identifies competitors of the focal item company. Applicants submit that claims 46-48 and 57-63 are in condition for allowance.

New independent method claim 68 has also been added. It is similar to claim 33, except the second field in claim 68 identifies customers. For reasons analogous to those set forth above, applicants submit that claim 68 is new and nonobvious in view of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims presented in the present application, as either amended or initially presented in this Amendment, are in condition for allowance. Applicants' present Amendment should not in any way be taken as acquiescence to any of the specific assertions, statements, etc., presented in the Office Action not explicitly addressed herein. Applicants reserve the right to specifically address all such assertions and statements in subsequent responses.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to properly respond to the Office Action and believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any remaining concerns, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below so that such concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 3, 2008



Mark G. Knedeisen
Reg. No. 42,747

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS, LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Ph. (412) 355-6342
Fax (412) 355-6501